**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT :**

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC**

**TUESDAY, THE 4TH SEPTEMBER 2007 / 13TH BHADRA 1929**

**WP(C).No. 26117 of 2007(H)**
**----------**

**PETITIONER:**
**----------**

**MASTER RANDHEER LAKSHMANAN (MINOR), DILPASAND, PALLIKUNNU P.O., KANNUR THROUGH FATHER AND GUARDIAN, T.P. LAKSHMANAN.**

**BY ADV. SRI.A.MOHAMED MUSTAQUE**
**SRI.M.K.SUMOD**
**SRI.KAUSER EDAPPAGATH**
**SRI.K.R.AVINASH (KUNNATH)**

**RESPONDENT:**
**----------**

**THE COMMISSIONER FOR ENTRANCE EXAMINATION, OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER FOR ENTRANCE EXAMINATION, SANTHI NAGAR, TRIVANDRUM.**

**BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.I.V.PRAMOD**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 04/09/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

**ANTONY DOMINIC, J.**
**==========**
**W.P.(C) NO. 26117 OF 2007**
**==========**

**Dated this the 4th day of September, 2007**

**J U D G M E N T**

Petitioner appeared for the Engineering/Medical Entrance Examination and had opted for Engineering. He was included in the provisional list of physically disabled candidates (P.D). It is stated that when he was not allowed to exercise option, enquiries were made and the petitioner was informed that there was a Committee on 6th of July to examine the disabled candidates and as the petitioner had not appeared before the Committee, his name was removed. According to the respondents, that was the reason for excluding the petitioner. The grievance of the petitioner is that he did not get any notice and he also avers that there was no publication in the website or in the newspaper.

2. Learned Government Pleader on instructions submit that until last year the practice was to publish notice only through newspapers and the website. According to him, in addition to the above, this year individual notice was also given. It is pointed out that despite all these the petitioner did not appear before the Committee. According to the learned Government Pleader, the respondents cannot be faulted for removing the petitioner.

3. Though the petitioner may be justified in complaining that he did not get any notice, I do not find any substance in the same. If the petitioner was vigilant, he would have certainly come to know of the committee meeting when notice of the same was published in the newspapers and also website. This evidently is a situation which arose out of the sheer negligence of the petitioner, for

which the respondent cannot be faulted. I do not find any merit in the contentions raised and the petitioner is not entitled to any of the reliefs sought for.

Writ petition lacks merits and it is dismissed.

**ANTONY DOMINIC, JUDGE.**

Rp